



Interview Summary	Application No. 09/813,988	Applicant(s) SUEHIRO ET AL.	
	Examiner Timothy L Rude	Art Unit 2883	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Timothy L Rude.  (3) Tarifur Chowdhury.
 (2) Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.  (4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 August 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Images of display performance.

Claim(s) discussed: All.


Identification of prior art discussed: Applied prior art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) The issue of Focal Conic state causing defects in the interline regions was discussed including the issues of Black Matrix hiding said defect and whether the influence of Focal Conic would be positive or negative relative pixel area state of the liquid crystal, e.g., cross talk. 2) The issue of the claimed geometry and voltage relationships having resultant beneficial claimed performance was discussed including the implications of Applicant's enabling disclosure. Examiner will look into issues of Black Matrix and cross talk and will be happy to preview proposed claim amendments in an effort to expedite prosecution.